



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/421,580	10/20/1999	KIM C. SMITH	98-0865	4351

32718 7590 07/08/2002

GATEWAY, INC.
14303 GATEWAY PLACE
ATTENTION: MARK S. WALKER (MAIL DROP SD-21)
POWAY, CA 92064

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/421,580	KIM C. SMITH	
	Examiner Mylinh T Tran	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Request for Recon filed on 4/17/02.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on 04/17/02 has been entered and carefully considered. However, argument regarding rejections under 35.U.S.C 103 to claims 1-52 have not been found to be persuasive. Therefore, these claims are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed (01/31/02).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al. [US. 5,724,492] in view of Yeh et al. [US. 6,329,978]. As to claims 1, 14, 27 and 40, Matthews, III et al. discloses at least two selectable targets displayed on at least a portion of said display (Matthews cites...computer system displays informational and control objects consisting of multiple panels that facilitate browsing...see abstract and figure 6, column 15, lines 15-46); and said at least two selectable targets capable of being displayed in a simulated rotation about an axis while remaining continuously selectable during said simulated rotation (Matthews cites...the user can spin or rotate the three-dimensional object to reveal other menu panels. As each panel is revealed. The three-dimensional object is animated to show the spinning of the menu structure...see the abstract

and column 15, lines 47 through column 16, lines 15). The difference between the claim and Matthews, III et al. is a display, a cursor capable of being displayed on said display; a cursor control device capable of controlling said cursor's position and movement on said display. Yeh et al. teaches the display and the cursor (column 2, lines 43-67). Yeh et al. also teaches a cursor control device capable of controlling said cursor's position and movement on said display. (Yeh et al. cites the movement of the input device may detected, therefore, by the dedicated two axial mouse input device. The mouse may move in a very small range...see abstract and column 3, lines 17-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Matthews, III et al. and Yeh et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify selectable targets taught by Matthews et al. to include the cursor control device of Yeh et al., because of providing in order to provide a novel cursor control device in which a dedicated two axial mouse moves within a very small range so to generate a positioning effect of absolute coordinate as taught by Yeh et al.

As to claims 2, 15, 28 and 41, Matthews et al. also discloses interface is capable of varying the displayed size of said targets during said simulated rotation about said axis (column 15, lines 15-35).

As to claims 3, 16, 29 and 42, Matthews et al. demonstrates targets are associated with a corresponding function capable of being performed in response to selection of said targets by a user via said cursor and said cursor control device (column 12, lines 10-38).

As to claims 4, 17, 30 and 43, Matthews et al. demonstrates interface is capable of displaying additional information, on at least a portion of said display, associated with a specific target when said cursor is positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary (column 13, lines 3-23).

As to claims 5, 18, 31 and 44, Matthews et al. also demonstrates interface is capable of modifying said targets being displayed on said display in response to a change in focus on content being displayed in another portion of said display (column 1, lines 35-67).

As to claims 6, 19, 32 and 45, Matthews et al. teaches the interface is capable of displaying said simulated rotation of said targets about said axis in a simulated three dimensional presentation (column 20, lines 6-21).

As to claims 7, 20, 33 and 46, Matthews et al. also teaches the interface is capable of providing focus to a specific target in response to said cursor being positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary (column 13, lines 3-44).

As to claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 35, 47 and 49 Matthews et al. shows the cursor is capable of modifying its presentation into a shape similar to the shape of a specific target which is being given focus by said cursor and the modification in the presentation of said cursor further comprises changing the shape of said cursor into a shape similar to a miniature version of the shape of said specific target. (column 1, lines 20-67).

As to claims 10, 23, 36 and 49, Matthews et al. also shows the targets are displayed as an animated sequence of movement (column 19, lines 2-16).

As to claims 11, 12, 24, 25, 37, 38, 50 and 51, Matthews et al. discloses each of said at least two selectable targets is presented as a polygonal shaped target and polygonal shaped target is capable of displaying content on each of its user-visible sides (figure 6 and column 15, lines 15-35).

As to claims 13, 26, 39 and 52, Matthews et al. also discloses the targets are capable of remaining visible as said targets travel in a simulated rotation about said axis (column 20, lines 6-21).

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued that Matthews does not teach “those menu panels or choices are continuously selectable because Mathews teaches that they rotate into view. So, the menu panels and choices are invisible and not selectable for a portion of the period of rotation” However, Mathew teaches the feature on figure 8, column 16, lines 27-45. Applicant’s attention is directed to the line “the viewer uses the directional control on the remote control unit to rotate the channel manager object until the desired panel is visible....The viewer determines whether to take some action associated with the visible panel..”” The emphasized words are “rotate the channel and desired panel is visible”. It rotates and selects panel until being visible. It is clearly that the limitation of claim 1 “at least two selectable targets capable of being displayed in a simulated rotation about an axis while

remaining continuously selectable during said simulated rotation" is suggested here.

Next, the Applicant has argued that "Matthews discloses a mouse device and a cursor. The Examiner has used Yeh to provide for features that are already disclosed in Matthews. Thus the combination of Mathews and Yeh is inappropriate" However, the Examiner does not agree. Although Matthews already shows the mouse device and the cursor, it is not clear enough to overcome the limitations in claim 1. So, the Examiner used Yeh to teach better in the mouse device and the cursor. ¹¹⁰²

¹¹⁰² In response to the Applicant's argument "No rotation and multiple targets are not disclosed by Yeh". However, the Examiner has used Matthews to teach the feature as said above.

Applicant has also argued that "Matthews does not teach the display of addition information when the cursor is positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary". However, the Examiner does not agree. Applicant's attention is directed to the line "the data object is a string of text that is displayed in a rectangular region on the display screen defined by the dotted box....The text contained with the rectangular boundaries shown for purposes of ease of understanding..." on column 13, lines 1-11. Matthews also cites the feature on column 14, lines 17-25. Applicant's attention is directed to the line "The program panel can also communicate secondary information such as the time remaining on the program...the channel is replaced by a "what's on" dialog.

Next, Applicant has argument that in Matthews there is no "said interface is capable of modifying said targets being displayed on said display in response to a change in focus on content being displayed in another portion of said display". However, Matthews teaches these features on column 1, lines 35-48, column 15, 59-67 and column 16, lines 19-24. Applicant's attention is directed to the line "Dynamic transitions are generated when the animation is required and can be altered and tailored to fit any situation at any moment....the principles of the present invention may be applied to display objects having various numbers of panels.." and "the viewer can use the remote control unit to spin the object and to reveal additional panels..."

Finally, Applicant has argued that "the cursor is capable of modifying its presentation into a shape similar to the shape of a specific target which is being given focus by said cursor". However, Matthews shows the feature on column 11, line 50 through column 12, line10 and column 12, lines 20-27. Applicant's attention is directed to the line "the set-top terminal then supplies this programming information in the proper format for presentation by the display".

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640, All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran
Art Unit 2173

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100